

MINUTES OF THE  
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
TRANSPORTATION REVIEW COMMITTEE

January 26, 1999

Maricopa Association of Governments Office  
302 North First Avenue, Suite 200, Saguaro Room  
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Gary Brown, Tempe, Chairman	Chris Plumb for Tom Buick, Maricopa County
Victor Mendez, ADOT	Jeff Martin, Mesa
*William Bates, Avondale	David Moody, Peoria
Patrice Kraus, Chandler	Tom Callow, Phoenix
*Randy Harrel, Fountain Hills	*Dick Schaner, Queen Creek
Tami Ryall, Gilbert	Ken Driggs, RPTA
Jim Book for Ken Martin, Glendale	Steve Hogan, Scottsdale
Doug Sanders, Goodyear	Ellis Perl for Bill Parrish, Surprise
Mike Cartsonis, Litchfield Park	

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS ATTENDING

Regional Bicycle Task Force: Patrick McDermott, Chandler	*Intermodal Management System Working Group: Dave Berry, Swift Transportation Company
*Street Committee: Ron Krosting, Mesa	*Telecommunication Working Group: Debbie Kohn, Avondale
Pedestrian Working Group: Steve Hancock for Mike Branham, Surprise	

\* Members neither present nor represented by proxy.

OTHERS PRESENT

Chuck Eaton, ADOT	Paul Ward, MAG
Dan Cook, Chandler	Don Herp, Phoenix
Eric Anderson, MAG	Bryan Jungwirth, RPTA
Dawn Coomer, MAG	Harvey Friedson, Tempe
John Farry, MAG	John Osgood, Tempe
Terry Johnson, MAG	

1. Call to Order

Chairman Gary Brown called the meeting to order at 10:06 a.m.

2. Approval of Minutes of January 5, 1999

Ken Driggs moved to approve the minutes of January 5, 1999. Jeff Martin seconded the motion, and the motion passed unanimously.

3. Call to the Audience

No audience was present to address the TRC.

4. Transportation Manager's Report

Terry Johnson addressed the committee to report on recent transportation planning activities and upcoming agenda items for the MAG Management Committee. Items discussed include the acceleration of the Regional Freeway System to 2007, update of the transit element of the Long Range Transportation Plan and the Freeway Life Cycle Program. Gary Brown asked when the TRC would take action on these items, and Terry responded that action would be requested for February.

5. Approval of Consent Agenda

Committee members can request that an item be removed from the consent agenda. Consent items are marked with an asterisk. Steve Hogan moved to approve the consent agenda. Jim Book seconded the motion, and the motion passed unanimously.

\*6. 1999 Update of the Regional Bicycle Plan

The MAG Bicycle Task Force has recommended approval of the 1999 Update of the Regional Bicycle Plan. The update revises goals and objectives, changes evaluation criteria for project selection, enhances plan maps, updates the funding plan, and documents possible future planning activities. With approval of the consent agenda, the TRC approved inclusion of the 1999 Update of the Regional Bicycle Plan in the Draft 1999 Update of the MAG Long Range Transportation Plan for a conformity analysis.

7. Report on the MAG Freeway Program

Eric Anderson addressed the committee to report on issues related to the Freeway Life Cycle Program. He noted that incorporating cost increases has become a challenge. He emphasized the need to keep the current schedule intact while accelerating the program to 2007. He added that he would be meeting with ADOT to discuss the addition of other highway projects to the program. Eric explained that final funding assumptions had been provided by ADOT, and that the Life Cycle Program should be ready for the joint meeting in February. He expected approval by the Regional Council in March. He added that two options would be included: completion by 2007 and completion by 2014.

Terry asked how material cost changes and FMS infrastructure had been incorporated into the program. Eric noted that these changes were in the acceleration option, and should be able to be included in the 2014 program. He noted that the base program would remain intact before anything was accelerated.

Ken Driggs welcomed Gary Brown as the new TRC chair. He asked about the joint meeting with ADOT, and asked if it would still be occurring. Victor Mendez responded that ADOT staff was working on scheduling the meeting, and that Mayor Guiliano would be meeting with the State Transportation Board to discuss issues of concern.

12. Guidelines for Programming Regional Transportation Funds: Additional Considerations

A meeting was held on January 19, 1999 to discuss four deferred items on the programming guidelines. These items include transit allocation, project size, match rates and cost effectiveness. Steve Hogan gave a summary of the meeting. He noted that cost effectiveness should be dropped, the issue of a transit allocation was not resolved, and that the issues of project size and match rates were addressed in a letter written by Jeff Martin to the TRC Chair. In essence, larger projects need a larger match to demonstrate local commitment. In addition, a transit allocation was needed, but the amount was undetermined.

Jeff discussed his letter, and noted that the match rate issue needed resolution before selecting projects for funding. He suggested a sliding scale and distribution of projects among jurisdictions. Steve added that there was no agreement on the sliding scale comment at the prior meeting. David Moody noted that he did not receive notice of the special meeting. Harvey Friedson and Mike Cartsonis expressed similar concerns.

Jim Book continued the discussion by noting that larger match may allow some cities to “buy” projects. Steve responded that making the larger match a requirement rather than an option would eliminate this problem. Mike Cartsonis mentioned that the Bike Committee had supported construction of underpasses and overpasses to enhance connectivity of facilities. Since these projects were very expensive, this policy could place these kinds of projects at a disadvantage. Chris Plumb noted that more detailed analysis of projects was needed before selection. Tami responded that small cities are unable to provide the type of analysis Chris described. Steve added that the TRC meeting on the 19<sup>th</sup> did suggest some type of waiver for small communities, but no specifics were discussed. Jeff Martin added that also discussed was using \$1 million as a possible cut-off before a higher match was required. Pat McDermott added that this sliding scale would address Mike’s concern about bike underpasses and overpasses.

Patrice noted that during the close-out process, project match amounts could be increased, and the committee discussed this idea. Jeff suggested making the match 25% for projects over \$1 million, and 50% for projects over \$2 million. Harvey asked how this would be incorporated in local capital improvement budgets. These budgets are completed on two-year cycles, and cannot be revised for projects already programmed. Jeff responded that the idea of the higher match is to determine local commitment to the project, and that standards need to be uniformly applied. Ken Driggs noted that

transit vehicles are purchased for many jurisdictions at the same time, and that aggregating vehicle bids increases efficiency. He said that this area needed to be addressed.

Jeff suggested waiving the standard for MAG and RPTA. Gary Brown asked when the guideline would be effective. Chris asked for the definition of a regional project.

Patrice emphasized the goal of leaving more money available to distribute to different jurisdictions. She added that different percentages may be more beneficial. David Moody noted that the local cost for projects already submitted was being relied upon by his jurisdiction, and that the policy should be implemented at a later time. Patrice noted that the policy would affect jurisdictions with projects over \$1 million. Steve suggested that a grandfathering process could be used. Projects identified as already funded would be exempt. Jeff asked about approved projects requesting additional funding, and Steve responded that the new standard would be used. Patrice agreed with Steve.

Patrice Kraus moved that each increment of higher cost would require a higher match rate as follows: (1) 5.7% for projects costs less than \$1 million; (2) 20% for projects costs between \$1 million and \$2 million; (3) 25% for project costs between \$2 million and \$3 million; (4) 30% for project costs between \$3 million and \$4 million, and (5) 35% for project costs above \$4 million. In addition, these match rates would not apply to MAG or RPTA, and projects currently programmed would be exempt under a grandfather clause. Jeff Martin seconded the motion.

The motion was discussed by the committee. Chris asked what types of projects would be included under the policy, and Jeff suggested some different percentages. The idea of simplifying the percentages was discussed as well. Jeff noted that RPTA could not be used to circumvent the process for higher match requirements. Mike Cartsonis voiced concerns about establishing priorities for the entire system, and Chris agreed. The chair asked for a vote, and the motion passed with Phoenix and Maricopa County voting against and ADOT abstaining.

8. Visual Screening Guidelines

ADOT has offered guidelines for consideration regarding visual screening for certain residential areas that do not qualify for noise walls. This change is estimated to increase freeway costs by \$5.4 million dollars. MAG has been requested to address this guideline. Discussion of this item was deferred.

9. Close Out of the FY 1999 MAG Federally Funded Program

It is estimated that approximately \$15 million dollars in MAG CMAQ funds remain to be programmed for specific projects in FY 1999. These funds can only be applied to projects that have met all federal requirements and are ready to be obligated. In 1995 the MAG Regional Council adopted guidelines for prioritizing close out projects. A list of projects that appear to meet close out criteria are sorted by priority category was provided. Discussion of this item was combined with item 10.

10. MAG Federally Funded Program for FY 2000-2004

Terry Johnson provided an overview of CMAQ funds available for programming. He noted that the totals did not include rideshare, freeways or contingency funds. He also reviewed the schedule for approval of the Plan update and TIP. The amount of funds available are listed below.

1999	\$14.5 million
2000	\$18.6 million
2001	\$16.8 million
2002	\$14.2 million
2003	\$13.3 million
2004	\$18.3 million

Paul Ward distributed the list of street projects submitted for funding. He described the projects. He noted that many were stabilization projects. Chris added that the County project was a research project to determine the best stabilization techniques.

Sarath Joshua provided an overview of the ITS projects submitted. He explained that the projects were divided into three categories: route specific, area-wide and transit. Then, projects were scored according to the ITS rating system. Not all area-wide projects could be scored due to lack of data. The committee then ranked the projects across categories. Paul added that the ITS rated projects had been mailed with the TRC agenda.

Ken noted that some of the projects needed to be discussed since not all could be accelerated as ranked. Jeff added that the new local ranks were needed before a decision was made, and that a special meeting may be necessary. Tom Callow asked if an additional column could be added to the forms to show the total federal cost allocated to each jurisdiction by mode. Terry noted that a line could be drawn on each modal sheet to show this information, and Gary agreed.

Tami asked for some information on the potential exchange with ADOT for STP funds. Terry responded that Eric noted that the magnitude of funding increase for the freeway system was approximately \$300 million. Tami asked what an additional \$6 million would do for the freeway program. Terry responded that CMAQ could be used for turning movements and not capacity-expanding projects.

Paul asked for some guidance on how to address acceleration of design and scope increases for the 1999 close-out and the FY 2000-2004 TIP. Gary noted that these projects could be discussed at the special meeting. Ken asked about the transit allocation, and noted that it should also be discussed at the special meeting.

Pat McDermott then provided an overview of the bike projects. He noted that education is a high priority, and that projects ranked higher if they were in denser areas. He added that some suburban projects may be underfunded. He concluded that bicycle projects needed higher funding in general since bicycling helps to improve air quality.

Jeff suggested using \$7 million as a tentative transit allocation to see how the resulting projects would appear. Gary asked if other modes should have an allocation, and Jeff responded that there should not be other allocations. Steve Hancock then provided an overview of the pedestrian and multi-use path projects. The projects were ranked subjectively, and projects with pedestrian amenities were ranked higher.

Rita Walton provided an overview of the telecommunications projects. The project includes several aspects, including bringing member agencies up to standard with e-mail and Internet access, operating expenses and facility upgrades.

Jeff suggested some initial guidance for MAG staff in providing a list of projects for approval. He suggested allocating \$6 million to transit, \$4 million to streets, \$2 million each to bicycles, pedestrians and ITS. In addition, \$2 million would be provided for telecommunications. Chris noted that the entire program needed to be examined when determining allocations. Gary requested that the list be available for the next TRC meeting, and that proportions be used rather than numbers. Jeff agreed with the use of proportions, noting that the amount available would vary by year. Jim asked for a definition of transit projects, and Patrice responded that all of RPTA's projects would be considered transit. Ken mentioned that RPTA has submitted projects for bicycles and ITS as well. Patrice noted that RPTA should determine their own priorities. Chris added that projects should be selected based on need.

Jeff acknowledged the complexity of the need to divide funding between modes and jurisdictions. David Moody expressed a need to know what the list of funded projects would look like before deciding on the allocations. Terry noted that ITS may not be getting enough, and suggested giving \$4 million to ITS and \$2 million to streets. Jeff thought \$2 million for streets was too low, and Patrice noted that this was a first-cut and not a final decision. Terry asked if \$3 million for each was more appropriate. Mike noted that projects should be focused to meet the needs of developing areas. Tom noted that too much was being spent on streets and that the benefit was localized. He expressed support for allocating \$3 million to each streets and ITS for the initial cut. There was general consensus on this idea.

11. ADOT I-10 Corridor Study

ADOT is undertaking a corridor study of I-10 between Phoenix and Tucson. ADOT staff will be available to provide a briefing on this project. Discussion of this item was deferred.

13. Next Meeting Date

The next regularly scheduled TRC meeting is at 10:00 a.m. on February 23, 1999. A special meeting to discuss project selection will be held on February 9 at 10:00 a.m.

The meeting adjourned at 12:15 p.m.